

4106.C.58
2
LETTER

FROM

Edinburgh

TO

Dr. SHERLOCK,

Rectifying the Committee's Notions of

SINCERITY.

Defending THE WHOLE of the

B. of Bangor's Doctrine:

AND MAINTAINING

That *Religion*, not a Profession of it, *is Religion*;

That *The Gospel*, not a Corruption of it, *is The Gospel*;

That CHRIST, not the Church, *is CHRIST*.

In which is

An APOLOGY for the *English Dissenters*.

WITH

A Word or two relating to Mr. TOLAND.

By GILBERT DALRYMPLE, D.D.

The second Edition, corrected.

L O N D O N:

Printed for J. ROBERTS in *W. Warwick-lane*, A. DODD

without Temple-Bar, and J. FOX in *Westminster-*

ah. MDCCXVIII.

(Price Six Pence)

The Publisher of the Second Edition,
To the *R E A D E R*.

THE *jocose* part of this book has, since *Tuesday* last, been so well receiv'd by the *Laity*, and the *argumentative* part of it by the *Clergy*, that the First Edition of it is already Sold off. I venture in the Doctor's absence to Reprint it, as corrected by a Friend of the Doctor's now in Town. He has taken away the *two Thieves* that were in *p. 44.* as likewise *one Divel* that was there, and *another Divel* that was in *p. 48.* This he does of *his own accord*; neither *he* nor I knowing of any Objection that *has* hitherto been made, or that *can* be made to *those* or *any other* parts of the book, as printed in the first edition. *In Justice*, (I'm confident) no objection *can* be made to 'em: *In Malice*, MANY. The Author's design, when he *inserted* 'em, was only to represent the wickedness of the wicked in as *lively* colours as possible: His Friend's design, when he *retracts* 'em, is purely to oblige the Lord of *Bangor*, who is well known to love the worst of his enemies better than *Invective*.

N. B. The aforesaid Gentleman has ventur'd to remove the *Elephant* and *Louse* that were in *p. 41.* and to put a *Drummer* in the room of 'em. The Criticks, perhaps, will like the Emendation; but it has spoil'd an ingenious fancy of the Printer's, which no body that has seen the first Edition can be a stranger to.

Saturday, Oct. 24.



THE



T H E
C O N T E N T S.

MR. Toland's Gospel, and the Committee's
Christ, much Alike. Page 8.

*An Enquiry Whether Christians ever gave the
Church a Right to Un-Christian 'em.* p. 9.

— *Whether Christ ever gave the Church
a Right to Un-Christ him.* ibid.

*Dr. Sh.'s Impertinence, about sincerely rejecting
Jesus Christ and the Sacraments.* p. 9, 10.

— *Affertion that God has committed the
Dispensation of his favour to the Church,
examin'd.* p. 10, 11, 12.

*An Account of his Notion that the Church's pas-
sing Sentence is passing no Sentence of the
Church's, but, Declaring God's. — A Diffe-
rence between God's and the Church's.* p. 13, 14.

His Abuse of Sincerity and the Pope. p. 14, 15, &c.

An unobserv'd Distinction relating to Sincerity.
p. 17.

The Dean's method of Converting a Papist. p. 18.

Advice to him on this Head. ibid.

*Remarks on the vulgar Distinction between SINCERE
and RIGHT.* p. 19, 20, &c.

The CONTENTS.

<i>That it has no Weight in it.</i>	p. 20, &c.
<i>That if it had, it wou'd stand a Dissenter in as much stead as a Church-man.</i>	p. 19, 20, &c.
<i>Remarks on the Distinction between sincerely RIGHT and sincerely WRONG.</i>	23, 24.
<i>That it has no Weight in it.</i>	p. 24.
<i>That if it had, it wou'd stand a Dissenter in as much stead as a Church-man.</i>	ibid.
<i>Answer to Objection, that there's less seemingness of Sincerity on a Dissenter's side, than on a Church-man's.</i>	p. 25, 26.
<i>Remarks on this Objection as coming from Dr. Sherlock.</i>	p. 26.
<i>All sincere Christians intitul'd, not only to God's Favour, but to an equal Degree of God's Favour.</i>	p. 23.
<i>The Dean's, and Committee's Doctrine of Sincerity, flagrantly Repugnant to it self.</i>	p. 22.
<i>An Observation on the Head Committee-man's espousing the Cause of Mr. Law (the Non-juror.)</i>	p. 26, 27.
<i>Answer to Dr. Sh.'s Qu. about the Church's Authority.</i>	p. 29. 30.
<i>Proof that he inadvertently Denies it by his way of Asserting it.</i>	p. 30.
<i>To say the Bp.'s Doctrine against the Church's Absolute Authority is True, is to make the Truth answerable for his Denying</i>	<div style="font-size: 3em; line-height: 1; display: inline-block; vertical-align: middle;">}</div> <div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: middle;">p. 31.</div>
<i>ALL Authority to the Church.</i>	
<i>To say it's False, is to Assert the Church's Absolute Authority.</i>	
	Upon

The CONTENTS.

- Upon Absolutely and Properly.* p. 32.
- A Short account of the Nature of this grand Controversy, as consider'd on both sides of the Question.* p. 33.
- A Prediction relating to the new Charge his Lordship is threaten'd with by Dr. D.* p. 28.
- Answer to Dr. D. with respect to Mr. Toland.* p. 34, 35.
- About quoting Scripture for Persecution.* p. 36.
- Remark on the Bishop's enemies Disowning, that they write up the Devil's kingdom, by writing down Christ's.* p. 37, 38.
- That the Committee's guilt of denying God and Christ their Prerogatives, is not Diminish'd by denying them Circumlocutorily.* ibid.
- The vulgar Objection, that the Bishop is against the Church, ridicul'd.* p. 38, 39, &c.
- The Mob, the Church, & a Hobby-Horse.* p. 40.
- Parson and Plumb-pudding.* ibid.
- Two Hereticks.* p. 41.
- The Dean and a Drummer.* p. 39.
- The Dean and a Cook.* p. 42.
- The Dean and the Devil.* p. 43.
- A Greek Devil and an English one.* ibid.
- Dr. Sherlock's little Toe.* p. 39.
- A Defence of a Word or two in this Book.* p. 42, 43, &c.
- Argument that if Christ's Kingdom is Christ's, the Devil's Kingdom is the Devil's.* p. 43, 44, 45.

The CONTENTS.

<i>A necessary Distinction between the Meaning of the Com.'s Doctrine, and the Meaning of the Com.</i>	P. 45.
<i>Between the Meaning of the Dean's Doctrine, and the Meaning of the Dean.</i>	ibid.
<i>How to ask What o'Clock it is.</i>	P. 29.
<i>Friendly Advice to Dr. Sherlock.</i>	P. 46.
<i>A Character of his Writings.</i>	ibid.
<i>Instructions to him How to Answer me.</i>	P. 47.

To the Reader.

N. B. AS often as the author charges the Church (or Clergy) with being guilty of &c. he means only those *some of the Church*, who are *really* guilty of &c. and who *call* themselves the Church. And the Character given Dr. Sh. and his Cause (tho' seemingly severe, you'll find (if you read the *whole*) is back'd with a *reason*; with *such* a reason as the *Author* takes to be a *good* one; and such a one as he apprehends *others* will take to be such, 'til the Dr. or his Friends shew, that it is not.

'Tis desired that the *Argument* in the Book, not the *Merriment*, may *chiefly* be attended to; and that the seemingly severe Expressions, being built *upon Reason*, may be regarded, not as *Raileries*, but as Expressions built *upon Reason*; and that they may stand or fall with *the Reason* they are built upon.



High and Mighty Dr.



YOU seem particularly fond of being distinguish'd by the controversy, and the part you act in it. But is there any *honour* in being at the head of a Bad cause? or is there any *modesty* in calling it a Good one? a cause that has Less regard to Religion than to a Pretence of it; More to the Authority of the Church, than to the Church. Your abilities might be better employ'd, and with more advantage to You and Themselves, than in attempting to establish *such* a cause! a cause which has it's own weakness, and the ablest adversary, to destroy it. I know not who envies you the reputation of being employ'd in so extraordinary a work. who is there that can Perform such a task? who is there (except the dean) that wou'd in earnest Undertake it? for my part, I don't at all wonder at *his* undertaking it; for the dean must excuse me if 'tis my opinion of the dean, that he's a vain man, and has a much better title

title than his Lordship, to that abominable character he has given of his Lordship, — That he'll stick at nothing.

There's a certain popular man in the world, who acts as if his conscience were a slave to his ambition; and whose character, as given him by his own conduct, is this — that for the sake of being Supreme in *any* party, he'd undertake the Defence of it. I wou'd by no means have it thought that the deari of C. is hinted at. but let him be who he will, To give him this character, is to name him.

You, Sir, being a Great man at this time in the church, are for making the church Greater than every body else. the church, we are told, has authority in affairs of salvation: and a christian's religion is not a christian's, but the church's. the church is a Law-giver, the church is a King, the church is CHRIST, the church is Every thing but the church. This, we see, is the New Doctrine of the committee. I find, Sir, we are to have All things New in a little time. Mr. Toland has furnish'd us with a New Gospel, and the Committee have supply'd us with a New Christ.

No christian will thank the committee for being so kind to the church. whether the church will thank 'em, I know not. the power bestow'd by the committee on the church is a great one: but then 'tis such a power as 'tis neither the church's Right to Accept, nor the com.'s to Bestow.

As to what you and the committee and others advance in favour of the church's *Right to Unchristian* people, I would ask you, Who gave it 'em? Whence do they derive it? Do they derive it from *Christ*? Or do they derive it from *the People*? Nor from *Christ*; for *Christ* never gave the church a Right to inroach upon *Christ's*: Not from *the People*; for the *People* never gave the Church a Right to inroach upon the *People's*. But if they derive it neither from *Christ*, nor from *the People*, they cannot derive it from any other Quarter. If so, How it comes to be a *Right*, I know not; nor what cou'd induce the dean to believe that the Church have a *Right* to do *Wrong*. This, methinks, is to rob the Devil of his *Right*.

In speaking of a * *sincere Rejector of Jesus Christ, or the Two Sacraments*, Dr. Sh. I suppose, means to lash at Two persons; at Dr. Sh., and the Quaker: at Dr. Sh., as a Rejector of *Jesus Christ*, by preaching up, not *Jesus Christ's* kingdom (as formerly), but *the Clergy's*; at the Quaker, as a Rejector of *Baptism and the Lord's Supper*. I would ask now in the first place, Whether a Dr. of Divinity's preaching up *Jesus Christ's* kingdom, is an essential Mark of his being a Christian; and consequently, Whether Dr. Sh's. thus rejecting *Jesus Christ*, by preaching up the

* Vide Dr. Sherlock's Pref. to *Streb.* p. 5. and Rep. of the *Cam. Fol. Edit.* p. 9. * Pref. p. 6.

Clergy's instead of it, is an essential Mark of his being None? In the next place, Whether embracing Baptism and the Lord's Supper, is an essential Mark of being a Christian, and consequently, Whether the Quaker's rejecting them, is an essential Mark of his being None? To the former of these two queries, I will venture to answer in the affirmative; to the latter *You will*: And then according to our two answers put together, neither a Dr. Sh. nor a Quaker, is a Christian. If so, tell me Dr. Whether the Sincerity you are speaking of, *i. e.* Whether the Sincerity of a *Dr. Sh.* or a *Quaker*, has any thing to do with the Sincerity of a *Christian*? and consequently, Whether your Objection against the doctrine of the Bishop, has any thing to do with the doctrine of the Bishop.

In Page the 8th of your Preface, you abuse God and the Church, by telling us that God's Favour is not God's, but the Church's. This you assert (whether you design it or no) when you assert *expressly* that *God has committed the Dispensation of his Favour to the Church i. e.* that God has made a God of the Church. But, *where* pray, has He done this? Either in Scripture, or no where: If in Scripture, I conjure you to tell me, in what Passage of Scripture; and not only in what Passage but, In what Manner has he done it? For either 'tis in the express Words of that Passage, or in your own Construction of it: In the express Words of it, then *the Bishop*
I

I'm sure, will give up the point: but if only in your own Construction of it, then *You*, certainly, ought to give it up; for, in this case, To Maintain it, is To say your own Construction of a Passage in Scripture, is that Passage. But let me tell you, Sir, I shall as soon believe, a Lawyer is Law, because *you say* he is Law, or that a Divine is Divinity, because *you say* he is Divinity, as that your Dictates are Scripture's, because *you say* they are Scripture's. When the Devil tells me that the Church of the Devil is the Church of Christ, shall I believe him? Or when a profane Interpreter tells me, that a profane Interpreter's Construction of Scripture is Scripture, shall I believe him?

You carry on your story indeed very plausibly, when you assert that God has not only given Man the Disposal of God's Favours, but has even * prescrib'd to him in the Scripture, *Means and Rules* How to dispose of 'em. Your being so particular in asserting your Falsehood, gives such a *Colour* of Truth to it, as might induce those who know neither Dr. Sh. nor the Scriptures, to believe you; and, in *Humanity*, not to think you capable of belying God and the Gospel *twice* within *two* lines. But there are *some* in the world, who have learnt God and Dr. Sh. better than so. There are

* Pref. to Steb. p. 8.

some that have their Senses and their Christianity about 'em; and that love Truth better than a Colour of it. *These* men, you must imagine, will be apt to charge, not God, but Dr. Sh., with making God's Favour be at the Disposal of such as know not how to Dispose of it.

I beg, Doctor, you won't be angry at me for agreeing with this sort of men in this sort of sentiments; at least 'till you have been pleas'd to inform the ignorant world *when* and *where* God dispos'd of his Own prerogative to his Creatures; *when* and *where* he *prescrib'd* any Means and Rules for the Use of it; and *what* are those Means and Rules. 'Till you have made these things as clear as the light, give me leave to think your Doctrine a bad one; and your Defence of it a worse: a Defence that wou'd *cheat* the Ignorant into the Belief of things which are only fit for *the Dean* to Teach, and for *the Ignorant* to Believe. But it's to be hop'd but *few* men have ignorance Enough for the dean's Purpose. For my part, I have a better opinion of the *Understandings*, as well as of the *Christianity* of Christians, than to think the Dean's gospel will pass for our Saviour's.

In Page 10th, you make the church and yourself ridiculous, when you advance, that the church's sentence is not the church's sentence, but a Declaration of God's: "The Church (say you very wisely) judges, *i. e.* " *passes*

passes Sentence, according to God's Will;
 therefore does, in truth, pass no sentence of
 its Own, but Declares the sentence of God.
 — He that has eyes to see, let him see that
 the church's advocate, instead of denying that
 they are chargeable with the guilt they are
 charg'd with, gives a *New Name* to their guilt,
 and calls it *Declaring the Sentence of God*, i. e.
 (properly) the Will of God, as notify'd in
 Scripture. But to declare the Will of God, as
 notify'd in Scripture, goes no farther than to
 declare, that he who is *certainly Insincere* is a
Sinner, and shall be punish'd by God as such.
 Now I wou'd ask, Whether the church don't
 take upon 'em to *Judge* who is, and who is
not Insincere; and to pass Sentence on him as
 Insincere, whom they do *but presume* to be In-
 sincere? To the Question* you have answer'd
 Yes already. I'll ask you again then, Is this
Declaring God's Will? God forbid! Reader, if
 any man tells you so, answer him, that it's
 not the Will of God, but the Will of the
 Church. I wish indeed that God's Will were
 the Church's, but pray God the Church's
 may never be God's. The Will of God is, that
 He, and He *only*, who is *certainly* insincere,
 shall be punish'd by God, as insincere: The
 Will of the Church is, that not He only who
 is *certainly* insincere, but even He whom the
 Church *presume* to be insincere, shall be pu-
 nish'd by God and the Church too, as insincere. A-
 way with this ridiculous Will of the Church!

* Pref. p. 5, and 6.

Away with this ridiculous Notion of *Declaring the Will of God!*--Ridiculous indeed! Monstrous Abominable! I insist upon it that by the Will of God, as reveal'd in Scripture, its reveal'd, that *insincere* men shall certainly be punish'd in the next world; but that it is *not* reveal'd, that the Dean of C. is an *insincere* man (tho' Most people think him so), or that he shall be punish'd in *this* world for his being so.

'Tis plain now what God's Will *is*, and *not*: God's Will *is*, that the man whom the *All-knowing* God *knows* to be *insincere*, shall be punish'd by God for *insincerity*; 'tis *not*, that the man whom the *unknowing* Church *presumes* to be *insincere*, shall be punish'd *either* by God or the Church (much less Both by God and the Church,) for *insincerity*.

'Tis merry to hear a *Blind* man's Notion of Colours; 'Tis equally merry to hear the Dean of C's Account of *Sincerity*. We have in p. 12. of his Preface, where he shews neither Wit nor Argument, but an Endeavour at both, when he puts foolisher notions than a Papist's into the head of a Papist; making him talk to this purpose, when a Protestant bishop goes about to convert him: "My Lord, for what purpose wou'd you convert me? I am *at present* sincere in the Profession of Popery; and, by your Lordship's principles, Sincerity will entitle me to the Favour of God, as well in My communion as in Yours. To what end then should I resort to the Means you propose of bettering

my Judgment? Here, Sir, either you
 mean for the Papist to speak of Sincerity, in
his Lordship's and *its own* Sense, or you do not:
 If you do *not*, 'tis Impertinence, and we may
 as well suppose the Papist to be talking to
 the Moon, as to his Lordship: But if you
 do, 'tis Absurdity, and will stand thus in its
 full Light. " — Sincerity requires I should,
 " *as long as I live*, listen to All means propo-
 " sed to me for judging and acting *Arigh*t :
 " I have listened to all such, *till to Day*. Till
 " to Day therefore, I'm *Sincere* : But to Day
 " *more* such means are propos'd to me ;
 " What shall I do in This case ? Why, as I
 " am *Sincere till to Day*, I'll not listen to
 " them ; --i. e. *I have been Sincere* hitherto,
 " *therefore* I'll not continue *so*. The Papist is
 much obliged to the Dn. for putting his own
 Non-sense into the mouth of the Papist.--
 In Kindness to the Pope, I'll dwell a little
 longer on shewing himself to himself, ac-
 cording to the Dn's account of him. The
 Pope, we'll suppose with the Dn, has been all
 along *till to Day* very *Sincere* : Why, because
 he has acted according to a Judgment, which,
 till to Day, he has used All the means he
 could come to be *right* in. To Day, we'll
 suppose, an English bishop proposes to him
 New and Clear reasons Against popery, and
 For his conversion : To Day therefore he has
more means to come at, than he had *Yester-*
day, of being *right* in his judgment. He *slights*
 these *New means*, he *knows* he *slights* them ;
 and

and yet at the same time *thinks* (if we'll believe the Dn.) he makes *as much* Use of them and (if we'll believe the Dn. again) *really* do make *as much* Use of them, when he makes Use of them, as if he *Used* them. -- This *absurd* meaning, Sir, is yours; or else a meaning that is *not to the purpose*: for (as I said before) either you, and your friend the Pope in this Conference speak of Sincerity in his Lordship's and *its own* sense, or you do not: if you do *not*, I still say the Pope and You are two *impertinent* fellows; and then pray get you gone, both of you, about your own businesses, for his Lordship and I have nothing to do with you: But if you *do* speak of it in That sense, then I'll beg leave to repeat what That sense is: A man can never be said to be Sincere in *that* sense, but when in the Love of Rectitude he uses *all* the means he can come at to *Rectify* his judgment, before he acts according to that judgment: To say then (as you and the Pope most strangely do) that the Pope when he has *slighted* the *last* means that have been propos'd to him for rectifying his judgment, and *knowingly* slighted them, is as sincere as he was *before* he had slighted them, *i. e.* To say such a one is sincere, in his Lordship's and the True sense of Sincerity, is in effect to say that Acting according to a judgment which one has *not* us'd All the Means one could come at to be Right in, is Acting according to a judgment which one *has* us'd All the Means one could come at to be Right in.

No

NOTHING is properly Sincerity, but what is Sincerity in its *whole* Sense: *This last* is Sincerity in its *whole* Sense; This last, and this last *only*, is Sincerity in *his Lordship's*, as appears from a very true account of it in a little Piece against Mr. Steb. which I would fain recommend to those two men, the Dean, and the Pope.

So it seems that Sincerity in its Whole sense and in his Lordship's, is quite a different thing from what it is in Yours; in Yours it signifies no more than a man's Acting according to his judgment as informed by all the means he *has* used to inform it *aright*: In its Whole sense and his Lordship's, it signifies his Acting according to his judgment, not only as inform'd by all the means he *has* used, but by All the means it *has been in his Power* to use, to inform it *aright*. This Distinction to me, I confess, is a material one, tho' *prima facie* so small as to be overlook'd by *you*, and indeed by *all* who have written against Christian Sincerity. By overlooking it you and they have been led into *one* Error, and *by that* into a *thousand* more.

WHAT I have been saying *at large*, is *briefly* this. A Sincere Papist according to his Lordship has a title, to the Favour of God, *as being Sincere*: But you can't say that therefore a Papist *hitherto* Sincere, has a title to the Favour of God *as being Sincere*, when he *ceases* to be *Sincere*.--This indeed is the Case.

AFTER having troubled the reader and
C my

my self with an account of the way which the dean thinks would be a *wrong* one of converting a Papist, 'tis worth while to enquire *Which* way the dean thinks would be a *right* one? Why, in order to convert him, the dean's Doctrine tells us the dean would argue with him thus: "*Damn*able Wretch! thou art in a *Hellish* way! Go on, and tho' thou art *sincere*, thou wilt be *damn'd*.— But look here, *my* way is a *Heavenly* one, *my* way is the *only one intrinsically right* way; come in to it, tho' *insincerely*, and thou shalt *infallibly* be sav'd."— This indeed is a right Popish method of making Protestants Papists; but no body's, *except the Dn. of C's*, Protestant method of making Papists Protestants.

I N short, Dr. I'd not have you puzzle yourself any longer about these matters. At least, I'd not have you trouble your head about converting Papists to be Protestants, till you have converted Protestants to True Protestantism. In order to this, I'd advise you, in the first place, to convert *some* of the Church of England to the Church of England; and in the next, to convert the Dean of C. to Christianity.

T H E Dean's and the * Committee's account of *Rectitude* is as Wrong as their account of *Sincerity*: Which I much wonder at for, methinks, they should have taken more care than to Transgress rectitude in Describing it.

Salva

Salvation, say they, does not depend upon a *Sincere* way of Worship, but upon a * *Right* one; upon the *only ONE Right* way. Now let us see *Which* is this *only ONE Right* way. Dr. Sh. (being a *Church of England* man) will tell us that *His* is; why? because *in the Sincerity of his heart* he BELIEVES it is: Dr. Calamy too (being a *Dissenter*) will tell us that *His* is; why? because *in the Sincerity of his heart* he BELIEVES it is. Indeed if Dr. Sh.'s is the *only ONE Right* way, because *in the Sincerity of his heart* he *Believes* it is, *pari ratione* Dr. Calamy's is the *only ONE Right* way, because *in the Sincerity of his heart* he *Believes* it is. So, according to Dr. Sh. there are *TWO only ONE Right* ways of *Worshipping God*. But in answer to this, says Dr. Sh. I don't *only BELIEVE* mine to be such, but am *SURE* it is; because *the Scripture* (which is infallibly true) tells me it's such. Does the Scripture, pray, in *express* words, say, the *Church of England* way of worshipping God is the *only ONE Right* way of worshipping God? No, why, then 'tis not *the Scripture*, but Dr. Sh.'s *Construction* of Scripture, that tells him the *Church of England* way (*i.e., his own way*) of worshipping God, is the *only ONE Right* way. Now this is as strong an argument that Dr. Calamy's, as that Dr. Sh.'s, way of worshipping God, is the *only ONE Right* way: for as Dr. Sh.'s *Construction* of Scripture tells Dr. Sh. that the *Church of England's* way of Worship is the *only ONE Right* way, so Dr. Calamy's *Construction* of Scripture tells Dr. Calamy, the *Dissenters*, (not

the *Church of England's*) way of Worship, is the *only ONE Right* way. The Question then comes to be this, *Which* is the *only ONE Right* way of *Construing Scripture*, Dr. Sh.'s, or Dr. Cal.'s? Dr. Sh. will say Dr. Sh.'s is; Why? because Dr. Sh. after an honest and impartial Examination of his, *sincerely BELIEVES* his to be such. Dr. Cal. too will say, Dr. Cal.'s is; Why? because Dr. Cal. after an honest and impartial Examination of his, *sincerely BELIEVES* his to be such. Indeed, if *this* be a reason why *Dr. Sh.'s* Construction of Scripture is an *only ONE Right* Construction; 'tis equally a reason why *Dr. Cal.'s* is ANOTHER *only ONE Right* Construction.— Thus we see that as (according to the Dean and the Committee, &c.) there are TWO *only ONE Right* ways of *Worshipping God*; so (according to the Dean and the Committee, &c.) there are TWO *only ONE Right* ways of *Construing Scripture*.

IN short, it appears that if I choose *this* communion *sincerely*, I choose *aright*; and if I choose *that* communion (tho' the most contrary to *this*) *sincerely*, I choose *aright*. So that the ridiculous notion of an *only ONE Best* choice in opposition to a *Sincere one*, infers as many *only ONE Best* choices, as *Sincere* ones.

HERE we find the argument advanced a little while ago *in Prejudice of Sincerity*, Ends *in its Favour*; and that Dr. Sh. Himself, who, according to Himself, has made the very *Best* choice of a Communion, (*i. e. the Best God will expect from him,*) can hope for nothing from it on

any other score than its being such a choice as *Sincerity* directs him to. For even according to Dr. Sh., God's Favour attends a christian's worshipping God, *then, and then only*, when he worships him *in the only ONE Right way*; and that way Dr. Sh., has pitched upon is Dr. Sh.'s *only ONE Right way*, Because and *merely* Because he's directed to it, not by *Prejudice*, not by *Authority*, not by *Interest* or *Chance*, but by *Sincerity*: And I still insist upon it that by parity of reason the way Dr. Cal. has pitched upon is Dr. Cal.'s *only one Right way*, because he's directed to it, not by *Prejudice*, not by *Authority*, not by *Interest* or *Chance*, but by *Sincerity*.

It mayn't be amiss now to take a short Review of the Dean's and the Committee's argument. They make by it *two distinct* things of worshipping God in a *sincere* way and worshipping him in a *right* one; will have God's favour to attend none but a *right* way; will have the *Church-man's* to be a *right* one, and the *Dissenter's* only a *sincere* one: God's favour then according to the Dean &c, attends *but One* of these Two ways, because according to the Dean &c, *but One* of them is a *right* one. Now upon Examination it appears that That *One Particular* way which (according to the Dean, &c.) is a *right* one, is to be deem'd a *right* one, *because* and *ONLY because* he who follows it is *sincere* in it: For the same reason then, that *other Particular* way which, *as being distinct from This*, (according to the Dean, &c.) is

is a *wrong* way, is to be deem'd a *right* one, when he who follows it is *sincere* in it.

WE find at last that the *Two* only *ONE* Right ways of Worshipping God amount to *but ONE*; that a *Sincere* way, and a *Right* one, are one and the same; and that if God's favour is *sure* to attend *One* of these two ways, a sincere *Churchman's*, or a sincere *Dissenter's*, 'tis *equally sure* to attend *Both* of them.

THUS have I traced the Dean's doctrine of *Sincerity* and *Rectitude*, consider'd in its own *necessary* Meaning, to this *necessary* Consequence, *viz.* that it *Asserts*, and *Denies*, the very same thing; is thereby repugnant to itself; by being so, is a very false doctrine, because no doctrine that's repugnant to it self can possibly be true. That it's Repugnant to it self, is apparent to such (tho' *only* to such) as examine it; and with the same *Impartiality* as I have done. Certainly, To say with the Dean, that it's not a christian's duty to Worship God and Construe Scripture, in the way *his own Sincerity directs him to*, but in that which is the *only ONE Right way in it self*, is to make *Two* DISTINCT things of Worshipping God and Construing Scripture *sincerely*, and Worshipping God and Construing Scripture *aright*: ---- To say at the same time with the Dean, that the Dean, by Worshipping God and Construing Scripture only in *that way which his own Sincerity directs him to*, Worships and Construes in that which is *the only ONE Right way in it self*, is to make *ONE AND THE SAME* thing

of Worshipping and Construing *sincerely*, and Worshipping and Construing *aright*. -- Whether or no it is Justice to charge *such* a Doctrine with *Afferting* and *Denying* the very same thing, I leave *all* men, *except the Authors of it*, to determine.

The Dean, by this time, perhaps, will be for giving up the *Old* Question, and for proposing a *New* one. Being forced to drop his first Distinction (between a christian's being in a *Sincere* way and his being in a *Right* one) he'll be inclin'd to try the fate of a second; namely, Between *one* christian's Sincerity and *another's*; making it a question, Whether, tho' God's favour follows *every* christian's Sincerity, it does not follow *this* christian's Sincerity MORE than *that* Christian's; a *Churchman's* MORE than a *Dissenter's*; and consequently *Dr. Sh.'s* MORE than *Dr. Calamy's*? To this I answer, that God's favour follows the sincerity of a Christian, not consider'd as the sincerity of a *Church of England* Christian, but as the sincerity of a *Christian*; and therefore the Utmost degree of sincerity in a *Dissenting* Christian, has as good a title to the Utmost degree of God's favour, as the utmost degree of sincerity in a *Church of England* Christian; consequently *Dr. Cal.'s* sincerity, if *as much* as *Dr. Sh.'s*, is intitled to *as much* of God's favour as *Dr. Sh.'s*.

Obj. BUT how can *this* be (says *Dr. Sh.*)? Surely there's a Difference between being Sincerely *in the Right*, and Sincerely *in the Wrong*!

Dr.

Dr. Sh. as being a Sincere Churchman, is Sincerely *in the Right*; Dr. Cal. at being a Sincere Dissenter is Sincerely *in the Wrong*.

To this objection I have answer'd before, that the *Sincerity* of Dr. Sh's Choice of the Church of England Communion, not *his Choice* of the Church of England Communion, *constitutes* the *Rectitude* of his Choice. Its *Sincerity*, and its *Sincerity only*, MAKES it a *Right* one; take away then its *Sincerity*, and its *Sincerity only*, and it is a *Wrong* one. To say therefore that there's a Difference between a Christian's being Sincerely *in the Right*, and Sincerely *in the Wrong*, is an Odd way of talking; and has either *no* meaning, or none but *this*, viz. that there's a Difference between a Christian's being sincerely *Sincere*, and sincerely *Insincere*.

BUT supposing *Sincerity* and *Rectitude* to be *two distinct* things; and that of these two persons a sincere Churchman and a sincere Dissenter, *but One* is *in the Right*; this supposition will stand Dr. Cal. in as much stead as Dr. Sh; being as much in favour of *the Dissenter's Rectitude*, as of the *Churchman's*: for, from whence, pray, does Dr. Sh. conclude that the sincere *Churchman* is sincerely *in the Right*, but from *Dr. Sh.'s sincere Belief*, that he is so? Has not Dr. Cal. then the same reason to conclude, the sincere *Dissenter* is sincerely *in the Right*, from *Dr. Cal.'s sincere Belief* that He is so?

THE Dn, by this time will be for marching off from the second Question, as before from the

the first : The next Objection he'll fix upon I'll guess to be this, *viz.* That if when a Christian chooses a Communion, the *Sincerity* of his choice constitutes its *Goodness*, then certainly its *Degree of Goodness* is in *Proportion* to its *Degree of Sincerity* ; and if so, as the Dissenter does not give, nor seem to have, so good Reasons for Dissenting from the Church, as the Church-man for Assenting to it, there is a less *Seem- ingness* of Sincerity in the Dissenter's choice than in the Church-man's ; and if a *less Seem- ingness* of Sincerity, I may say *less Sincerity* ; for as I cannot see his Heart, I have no other rule whereby to judge of it, but by its *Seem- ingness* : Since by *this* Rule then, which is the only one whereby I can compare One man's sincerity with Another's, I find the Dissenter's choice of a communion to be *less Sincere* than the Church-man's, 'tis plain the Dissenter's is a *Worse choice in itself* than the Church-man's.

I may perhaps have occasion to answer this objection elsewhere ; so that at present I need only to observe that it will stand in a Dissenter's mouth against a Church-man, exactly in the same manner as in a Church-man's against a Dissenter ; and is as strong an argument against *charity*, as against *either* of 'em. A sincere Church-man, as *such*, must believe there is more Reason *on the Church-man's* side than *on the Dissenter's* : A sincere Dissenter, as *such*, must believe there is more Reason *on the Dis- senter's* side than *on the Church-man's* : And as a *Church-man's* Conscience, not a Dissenter's, must

D be

be judge of a *Churchman's* Sincerity ; so a *Dissenter's* Conscience, not a *Churchman's*, must be judge of a *Dissenter's* Sincerity. In these circumstances the one must *in duty* have a Good opinion of the other : and as long as he can see No insincerity, must *imagine* None: for, what in Other cases is *Right Reason's* rule, in This is *Charity's*.--
[*Non Apparentis, & Non Entis, eadem est ratio.*

But you'll say, To think so charitably is a *difficult* thing. Difficult indeed, to a *Wicked* mind ! — but Easy to a *Christian* one.

I can't close this head without taking notice of a thought that *forces* itself upon me whether I will or no ; namely, that if the *Utmost seemingness* of Insincerity is *Insincerity*, I need not tell Dr. Sh. *Which* man in the eye of the world is at this day *the most Insincere* man in the world.

So much for Sincerity and Rectitude. I think, I have sufficiently unmask'd your dark Doctrine concerning 'em, and expos'd it in all its various colours and complexions.

Look out now either for a *New Cause*, or for a *New Defence* of the Old one ; it totters mightily, and will certainly fall in a very little time, if you or the committee don't get a better prop to it than Mr. Law. 'Tis current here, that this Mr. Law you talk of is a Nonjuror, and, as such, a profess'd Enemy to the english establishment both in Church and State. If so, 'tis strange to Us that Mr. Law's sentiments should be the sentiments of the committee ; 'tis stranger still that no less than Two members of the committee should *tell us so*. But tho'

tho' they are the committee's sentiments, let no man think they are the Church's. *Who* or *What* is the Church, I shall have occasion to inquire hereafter: In the mean time, I need only to observe that if *the Committee* are the Church, then indeed Mr. Law's doctrine is the Church's: but if *the Church of England* is the Church, Mr. Law's Doctrine is, not the Church's, but Mr. Law's. To the Churchman that thinks Mr. Law (tho' a *Hicksian*) writes for the Church, and for that reason admires him, I would propose this Question; *Which* is a Fool, the Churchman or Mr. Law? If Mr. L. in opposition to Mr. L's Conventicle, writes *in favour* of the Church, *Mr. L. is* a Fool: and then, pray, why does the Churchman admire *a Fool*? But if Mr. L., in favour of Mr. L's Conventicle, writes *in opposition* to the Church, *the Church-man* is a Fool (for thinking Mr. L.'s doctrine is the doctrine of the Church): and then pray, what is Mr. L. the better for *a Fool's* Admiration?

Hence it appears that Mr. Law's defence of the committee, doesn't *justify*, but *expose* 'em. Now since Mr. L.'s sophistry is *useless* to 'em, and since your own is *exhausted*, I'm at a loss to know from what Quarter they expect a recruit. The Dean I know relies *on Mr. Steb.* as much as the Com. does *on the Dean.* I hope what is here advanced will *contribute* to make him and you and the Com. Converts to right Reason and the Gospel.

As to Mr. Steb.'s first Treatise, I need only

to *condemn*, not to *answer* it. I find we are to expect an *Answer* from Another : tho' for my part, I think it's as much beholden to Your Opinion of it for Deserving one, as a Fop is to Gold Lace for being a fine Gentleman.

I long for some New opinions from the com. and to know what the com. can say in excuse for the com. I doubt not but the Dn. (after his wonted way) is now in search for some *new Meanings* for 'em. What these *next Meanings* will be I don't know, nor I believe Any One Man, *except One* ; namely, *the Dean*.

An inconsiderable member of the Com. longs, it seems, to re-persecute his Lp, but finding the K. stands in his way, repeats your own sneer at the K. He's very angry at the Royal writ, but doesn't at all doubt the convocation's surviving it : and if they survive it, (according to him) they'll do wonderful feats indeed ! tho' they have miscarry'd in their First accusation, they will then venture at a Second ; and that Second, we are told shall be *this* : — *That his Lp. denies 3 are 1. Hitherto* his enemies have represented him as having *too much* respect for our Saviour : — *Shortly*, he's to be Represented as having *too little*. Let 'em go on as they intend, and his Lp. will have *nothing* to fear, but *more Victory* to hope for. If they add Ten Thousand Charges against him, I'll lay as many Odds as there are Members of the committee to One, that this One still gets the better of 'em : and that the Bishop will be *abler to Defend* the Bishop, than the Com. to *Oppose* him.

In

In p. 3. of your Pref. you ask a Question about a *Trifle* with all the Solemnity in the world. ---- 'I call upon your Lp. (say you), By all the Regard that is due to *Truth*, to *Religion*, to the *Gospel*, and to the *Church of Christ*, to tell me *without Disguise*, ---- **What Authority you allow to the Church.** a mighty important Question indeed! 'tis just as if I should ask a man *What o' Clock it is*, in this manner -- 'Friend, I call upon you, By all the Regard that is due to *Truth*, to *Religion*, to the *Gospel*, to the *Church of Christ*, to tell me *without Disguise* **What o' Clock it is.** ---- Truth, Religion, the Gospel, and the Church of Christ, have just as much to do with This question as with the Former.

So much for the *Manner* of your question. To the *Matter* of it I have very little to say, Except that these two questions shou'd always go together:

{ *How much* AUTHORITY has THE CHURCH?
 { *How much* HUMILITY has DR. SHERLOCK?

THE Latter, you'll say, is an *impertinent* question: I'll say the same of the Former, and that his Lp.'s *best* answer to it is This -- that it deserves *None*. *

In

* The point in question between his Lp. and the Com. is, How much authority his Lp. by his Doctrine *already* published, has *actually* DENY'D to the Church? To prove this, 'tis *impertinent* to ask How much authority, he in his own private Sentiments *not yet publish'd*, ALLOWS to the Church.

IN short, what authority the church has *not*, (I believe) is *no* Question with his Lp. What authority it *has*, is a *Question*, and will Always remain so. The best Resolution of it I can give you at present, is the following; *viz.* that the Church hath authority Enough to punish You and Others for abusing *his Lp.*, the Press, and the Pulpit, in that insolent manner you do. Perhaps I ought not to mention *You* and the *Pulpit* in the same period; because a correspondent of mine in the Temple assures me, You hardly trouble it *Thrice* in a *Twelve-month*.

ONE thing further I must observe relating to the Question you propose, and then hope to have done with *Question and Answer*. 'Tis only to tell you, that tho' it be a *great* Question *with you*, Whether the Bp., in *the whole* of the Bp's doctrine, is *against* All authority, 'tis a *very little* one *with me*, Whether the Dean, in *some parts* of the Dean's, is *for* All. 'Tis true, at the same time, that in those very parts, the Dean, by his method of *giving* All authority to the clergy does in effect *deprive* 'em of All, by making it *All* center in *That* which they have *no Right to*. but for this consequence the Laity are to bless, not his Design, but his Inadvertency.

Amongst all the flagrant falsehoods which have been so liberally fulminated against his Lp. from the press, the pulpit, and the mob, I cannot find that the most daring of his enemies has yet thought fit to charge him *in ex-*

press

press Terms, with preaching down *ex professo* All authority in the Church; but only with preaching it down, By preaching down all Absolute human authority. So that when you and others say his Lp. allows No authority to the church, you mean not in reality to charge him with that as *his doctrine*, but as a *consequence* of his doctrine. but is it *his Lordship* that makes that consequence? no; he says not a word about it. why then, it either makes *it self*, or is made by *his enemies*: if by *his enemies*, then his enemies must blame for it, not his Lp. but, his enemies; on the other hand, if it makes *it self*, i. e. if it follows *unavoidably* from the Doctrine his Lp. has asserted of the church's having no Absolute authority, then the Question comes to be this --- Whether you'll admit that Doctrine to be a True one, or not? if you admit it to be a True one, then To say the Consequence you blame his Lp. for, follows *unavoidably* from the Doctrine his Lp. has asserted, is to say it follows *unavoidably* from the Truth his Lp. has asserted; if so, when you blame *his Lp.*, you blame *the Truth*, for Asserting it. This is the Drift of what you offer against the Consequence of his Lp.'s Doctrine, *supposing* you admit that Doctrine to be a True one: but if you say you do not admit it to be a True one, you expressly Assert what in other places you'd be thought to Deny, i. e. that the church have Absolute authority; for, that the church have not Absolute authority, is *re ipsa* the Doctrine of his Lp.

WHAT

WHAT I've been insisting on in a Great Many words, I'll repeat it in a Few. The authority his Lp. denies to the church, is an Absolute authority: An Absolute authority *you confess* the church have *not*: By asserting then that there's *no* authority for the church to have *but That* which his Lp. denies 'em, you assert that there's *no* authority for the church to have *but That* which *you confess* they have *not*. I wou'd ask you now in the first place, Do you your self *stand to it* that the church have *no* Absolute authority? to this you *daren't* say NO; I would ask you again, Do you your self *censure the Bp.* for *that very doctrine*? to this you have *often* said YES. Why, then permit me to put this fair question to you; --- *Which* of these two points are you *sincere* in: In *denying* with the Bishop that the church have Absolute authority; or In *censuring the Bp.* for denying it? 'tis manifest you do Both: and that you cannot be *sincere* in Both, is equally manifest, because they are Contradictories.

IN answer to what you advance at 4th or 5th hand upon *Absolutely* and *Properly*, I refer you to two things; *Common Sense* and the *Dictionary*. I have nothing farther to say to you upon this head, except that you are as much beholden to *Absolutely* and *Properly* for Mirth, as a Waterman to *Sculler, Oar*, for a Six-pence.

By this time Any reader is able to judge of the Controversy. He has two Questions before him: The First is *exceeding difficult* to determine; namely, Which of these two has the Right to dispose of God's favour, *God* or *The Church*? GOD's vindicator will have it that *God alone* has the Right to Dispose of the favour of *God*: THE CHURCH's vindicators will have it, that *The Church* (not *God*) has this Right. I leave every body's common Reason (*except The Church's*) to determine the Point.

THE second Difficulty is this; —Whose km. is the km. of Christ, *Christ's*, or *The Church's*? CHRIST's vindicator contends that Christ's km. is *Christ's*, and *wholly* Christ's: THE CHURCH's on the other side (Many of 'em) seem to insist upon it that Christ's km. is *The Church's*; and *wholly* The Church's: Some of 'em indeed will have it that it's Both *wholly The Church's* and *wholly Christ's too*; Others are for Compromising the matter, and insist upon it that it's *partly* Christ's, and *partly* The Church's, *i.e.* That Christ's km. is *but Half of it* Christ's. Here indeed are a great many Points to be determin'd: I again leave every body's common Reason (*except The Church's*) to Determine 'em.

Such are the B's sentiments! Such are the C's! The B. will have it that *the Church* has only *the Church's* Prerogative: The C. will have it that it has not the *Church's only*, but

E *Christ's*;

Christ's; that it has not *Christ's only*, but *God's*.

IN *what* manner now must we think of *the Bp.*? In *what* manner must we think of *the Com.*? what Encomiums can *flatter* the One? or what Outcries, what Malignity can *abuse* the Other? To *such a Bp.* the Panegyrick of a *Pliny* is no *Compliment*: On *such a Com.* the *Invective* of a *Juvenal* is no *Satyr*.

* A late Writer against Mr. Toland is angry at *his Lp.* for Mr. Toland's being in the *Right* in some Points, and therein agreeing with *his Lp.* † Another author too, who is a dull one indeed (I forget whether I mention'd him before) calls Mr. T. with an Irony, *his Lp's* || *HONOURABLE Assessor*. These gentlemen seem to think, that if among *Many* *BAD* opinions a man has *One* *GOOD* one, that *GOOD* one is, for that very reason, a *BAD* one. According to them then, if among a *Great* *Many* *half-pence* in my pocket I happen to have a *guinea*, that *guinea* therefore is *no guinea*, but a *half-penny*. 'Tis circumlocutorily alledg'd that Mr. T. is a *Deist*; has either *no* notions, or *wrong* ones, of *Christ's* *km*: that therefore from Mr. T.'s Agreeing

* Vid. Mr. Mangey's Anf. to Nazarenus.

† A late memb. of the Com. who troubled the World t'other day with A Pref. to the B. of B. Mr. P. and Mr. Toland.

|| Ib. p. 6.

with his Lp. that If there be such a thing as a km. of Christ, Christ Alone is *King in that Kingdom*, it follows that Christ Alone is not King in that km. — a Committee-Consequence indeed !

WHY shou'd it be made a new Charge against his Lp. and the Truth, that Mr. T. (the reputed Deist) Agrees with Them, and Differs from the Com. ? 'Tis either *Reason*, or *Religion*, that induces him : if *Reason*, 'tis *weak* in any *Advocate for the Com.* to charge his Lp. with a *Deist's* having *more Reason* than the Com. : but if *Religion* induces him, 'tis still weaker in an *Advocate for the Com.* to charge his Lp. with a *Deist's* having *more Religion* than the Com.

Poor Reasoners indeed ! As if his Lp's Arguments became *weak* ones by Mr. T.'s affirming 'em ! — What ! must a *Rich* man throw away Money, because a *Beggar* has Money ? or, must the *Bishop* DESERT the Truth, because Mr. Toland EMBRACES it ?

IF the Church may be right in every thing, surely a *Deist* may be right in *some* thing. — 'Tis to Mr. T.'s honour, and not at all to his Lp.'s disgrace, that they Agree in points where in No men, that have Sense without Prejudice, can Differ. His Lp. thinks an Unwarrantable authority, Unwarrantable ; Mr. T. thinks so : His Lp. for His opinion has His reason ; Mr. T. has His : Each has a good one ; The One, as a *Christian*, is for the Rights of a *Christian* ; the Other, as a *Man*, is for the Rights of a

Man : Neither of 'em for an Authority that Destroys Both.

Wou'd you know, Reader, whether the Committee-man who Hates Mr. T. in Love to God, to Christ, and to the Gospel, has a *sincere* Love for God, for Christ, and for the Gospel? Go to *him*, and *he'll* tell you *he has*; but go to *his Doctrine*, and it will tell you Another story. Who can believe *he's* a Friend to God, who would take away God's Prerogative? Who can believe *he's* a Friend to Christ, who would take away Christ's? Or who can believe *he's* a Friend to the Gospel, who *quotes Gospel* for doing so? Does the Gospel command people to Rob God, to Rob Christ, to Rob Christians of *their own*? consult the Robbers, and They'll tell you it *does*; but consult the Gospel, and it will tell you *otherwise*.

I'm never so angry as when I find men Burlesquing Scripture by making *every little*, selfish, ridiculous doctrine of *their own*, a doctrine of Scripture. The Dn., I observe, is Often doing this; but as often as I observe it, I imagin They must either be Weak persons or Wicked ones, who take the Dn.'s meaning of the Scripture, not the Scripture's, to be the Scripture's. I pray God I may Always take Scripture to be Scripture; and Human Corruptions of it (call 'em the Church's, or whose you will) to be but Human Corruptions of it. As long as I do this, I know I shall find that To write down Christ's km, is to Establish the Devil's.

Divel's.—Those who do so, we see, *disown* that they do so: their *disowning* it, makes 'em guilty of *two* things, *viz.* Of *Establishing* the *Divel's* km, and Of *Denying* they *Estab-*
lish it. But, pray, reader, observe in *what*
sense Alone it can properly be *Deny'd* that they
Establish the *Divel's* km:—Why, in *this sense*
Alone; They don't *expresly*, they don't *verbis*
ipsissimis teach some of the doctrines they are
 charg'd with. which puts me in mind of the
 Character that's given of a *Profane man*, by
 an old favourite author of mine, who wrote
Men with a peculiar justness, brevity, and
 humour, above a Century ago; “ *A Profane*
man (says he) is one that denies God as far
 “ as the Law gives him leave, *i. e.* only does
 “ not say so in down-right terms, for so far
 “ he may go.”—The men I've been speaking
 of don't assert Absolute authority in *these* very
 words [*We assert Absolute authority,*] there-
 fore (I warrant) when they assert it in *others*,
 they don't assert it. as if because a man is go-
 ing a *Round about* way to *Rome*, he's not go-
 ing to *Rome*. Shall a High-way-man, when he
 has *so Much* impudence, as to rob The K. or
 The Pr. in a *By-Lane*, have *so much More* as
 to tell Them he's *not* Robbing 'em, because
 he's not Robbing 'em in the *High-way*? or
 Shall a Committee-man, when he has *so Little*
 conscience, as to deny God and Christ of their
 Prerogative, have *so much Less* as to say he
doesn't deny it 'em, because he *doesn't* deny it
 'em in *this Undisguised* form [*I deny God and*
Christ

Christ their Prerogative]? Is denying it in many words, *less* denying it than denying it in a few? 'tis true indeed, in *other* words than *your own* you and others might have deny'd it 'em more *Glaringly*, but not more *Properly*, than in *your own*. This kind of modesty is, in reality, no *diminution* of Guilt, but a *disguise* of it. that it has no *Vertue* in it, I Affirm: but that it has no *Prudence* in it, I Deny; for, by means of this Blind you each of you escape the *Inadvertent Multitude's* Observing, and being Enrag'd at Observing, how much their *God*, their *Saviour*, and *Themselves* are Abus'd by their own tolerated clergy. So that *this* part of your conduct is owing, not to you but to your *Fears*, and may with more propriety be call'd an *artful* behaviour, than a *modest* one; inasmuch as by recurring to it, you are so far from not denying to God and Christ the Prerogative of each, that you deny it 'em *as far as you Dare* and to men of Penetration 'tis certain that your denying it *so disguisedly*, does not *hide*, but more than Any thing *express*, the *Heinousness* of your denying it; by shewing that you have wickedness Enough to be Guilty of, what ever you Your Selves are *Asham'd* to have it thought you are Guilty of.

BEFORE I go on, or rather Before I stop (for now indeed I begin to be weary of you), must make One observation for the use of such as say the Bp. is *against the Church*; why? why (say they) he denies All Authority to the Church non-sensical Cant! they may as well say the

Bp. is against *All Mankind*; for when he denies *All visible human Authority in the affairs of Conscience and Salvation*, the authority Deny'd is Deny'd, not to *the Church Alone*, but to *All Mankind*. When a man has lost the Use of *his Limbs*, is it proper to express it by saying he has lost the Use of *his little Toe*? or, when an Authority that belongs to *no* man is Forbidden *all* men, is it proper to say it's Forbidden *the Church*? who in the List of Mankind do but come under *this* number, -- *A Handful*.

In short, these two or three men *the Church* bear the same Proportion to the Rest, as the Drummers of an Army to an Army, or as The Dean of C's Good qualities to the Bishop of *Bangor's*.

It appears now that [*the Church*] has made the Bp's enemies Impertinent: 'twill appear presently that this Impertinence is of *use* to 'em; and that there's an End to serve by this word *Church*, which scarce *any other* word could contribute to. For 'em to say his Lp.'s doctrine tends to *overturn all Mankind*, wou'd be a *Romantick* account of it, and Regarded as *such*; and perhaps procure a Great Many *laughters*, but no *beliefs*; nor wou'd such an Accusation raise in people's minds so bad an Idea of *his Lp.'s doctrine*, as of *it self*: But, To say (as they do) that his doctrine tends *To overturn the Church*, is *Alarming*; Rouses an *Attention* to it in every man, and an *Aversion* in such, as are led, not by *Sense*, but *Sound*; and, for matter of Headpiece, differ from
Beasts

Beasts in *this*, --that they are *not call'd* so. That word *Mankind* is of no weight with the *Mob*; but by those Two words *CHURCH* and *CLERGY*, you may manage 'em, as Plow-men do *Horses* by *HIA, WO.* — *Church* (i.e. the name of it) the *Mob* are as fond of, as a *Child* of a *Hobby-horse*; and *Clergy* they Love, as a *Clergyman* does *Plumb-pudding*. For this reason the *Bp.'s* enemies when they write (well knowing they only write to *The Mob*) take special care to remember these two words; and you shall meet with *Church* and *Clergy* in their mouths as frequently, as *Thee* and *Thou* in a *Quaker's*. As for the *Dn.*, indeed to do justice to him, I think he does not mention this word *clergy* very often; but *church* is as dear to him, as *for god's sake* to a *Beggar*, or as *god damn ye* to a *Bully*.

THUS far I have been shewing that the bishop's sermon against *All visible human authority in affairs of Conscience* was preach'd, not *To the church Alone*, but to *All Mankind*; and if against one of 'em, against *both*.

LET us suppose now in complaisance to the dean, that the bishop's sermon had been preached, not *To All Mankind* but, *To the church Alone*. what ground is there in *this* case for the dean to *insinuate*, and for others to *assert*, that it's *against the church*? why, (say they) it *Opposes the church's Authority*: in what? in *Asserting Christ's*. --a wonderful Compliment to the Church! that the bishop is *AGAINST the Church*, by being *FOR Christ*! But is his *La*
Against

Against *All the Church* (i.e. Against *All the Clergy*) by being For Christ? Surely he isn't. Surely they are not *All* Against Christ. I wou'd hope that but *very Few* of 'em Maintain that our blessed Lord is *not sole King in his own Kingdom*; and that consequently his Lp. Opposes but *very Few* of 'em, by Opposing such an Extravagant doctrine. If one were to judge of *all the Clergy* by *some* of 'em, or if those who call Themselves the Church, were the Church, Christianity and the Church wou'd be very remote from one another.

If the wicked men whom every body sees I hint at are *the Church*, no doubt but the *Church* and such other Orthodox persons will think Me very Heterodox for talking at this rate Against *the Church*, and in Favour of those two Hereticks, *Truth*, and *The Bishop*. I freely confess I *am*, I always *was*, and I always *will* be (in spite of *the Church*), a sincere Friend and Servant to 'em, to the Utmost of *Words* and *Wishes*: and am sorry for nothing more, than that I have *nothing Better* to serve 'em with. I declare I cou'd as freely *Die*, as *Write*, for their Service. --As I'm a Friend to *Them*, so I'm an Enemy to *Such* (and *only* to such) as are *Their's*. If *All the Church*, i. e. If *All the Clergy*, were in That number, In Respect to the Clergy I should be sorry for it: But Thanks be to God, and to *Some* of 'em, that *Some* of 'em are out of it. *These*, I perswade my self, will think me no Adversary to *Them*,

by being so to *The rest* of 'em. No Good Clergy-man can be Angry at me for Reflecting upon *Bad* ones; No *Bad* one can *Disturb me* by his Anger.

AFTER having said so much in *Opposition* to the Dn., the world will excuse me (tho' perhaps *not easily*) if I offer SOMETHING in his *Favour*. The Dn. is (I was going to say *Blest*, but may more properly say) *Curst* with very great Abilities; for it appears he's distinguish'd by 'em from a Weak man, By being Abler than such a one to do a Great deal of *Mischief*. 'Tis a common Saying, that G. sends *Meat*, But the D--l sends *Cooks*: So I think one may say of the Dn., that G. gave him an *Understanding*, but the D--l gave him a *Will*. this is *certainly* true, if the Meaning of the Dn's Doctrine, is the Dn's; tho' not otherwise.

I am aware that the enemies of Christianity will dislike the Language I give 'em in two or three places, and think my Affection for Christ is too Affectionately express'd. To obviate this objection I request two things from you, viz. that I may offer a Few words in Defence of a Few; and that You will attend to 'em. I crave your Attention especially while I explain my self on this word *Drivel*, because I have some apprehensions it may suffer by the Constructions and Consequences you commonly make. As I remember, when his Lp., on the point

point of the Calumny, was so favourable as only to call you his Accuser, you presently began to think you had somewhere or other met with Διάβολος (Ang. the Devil) put for an Accuser; which fill'd your head so full of *Greek* and *the Divel*, that you thought his Lp., by calling you his Accuser, certainly meant to call you Διάβολος (Ang. the Divel.) — I shall finish my Greek with Reminding (not Informing) you that Διάβολος in the Septuagint &c., Now and Then signifies A FALSE Accuser; NEVER AN ACCUSER. — If on so little ground you believ'd the Bishop's meaning was to call you a *Greek* Divel, it's well if you don't often think I mean to call you an *English* one; and that when I name *the Divel* and *the Dean* in the Same line, my meaning is, to make Co-Divels of 'em. --- To prevent (I say) all such misunderstandings as these, I wou'd humbly offer to you what follows as a Key to *your* Doctrine, and to *my own* Notion of it.

THE Subject we are upon, is Christ's Kingdom. You and the Comm. advance that in this Kingdom Other persons Besides Christ, have an Authority of *adding* New Laws to Christ's equally obligatory with Christ's: To have such an Authority in Christ's Km. (say I) is To have Christ's Kingly authority of *making Laws* in Christ's Km.; To have Christ's Kingly authority of *making Laws* in it, is To have *all possible* Kingly authority in it; Whoever have this *all possible* Kingly

ly authority in it, are Kings in it. To advance then (as you and the Comm. do) that Other persons Besides Christ, *actually have* this all possible Kingly Authority in the Km. of Christ, is to set up those other persons as other Kings Besides Christ in the Km. of Christ: and To set 'em up as other Kings *Besides* Christ, is To set 'em up as Kings *in Opposition to* Christ, in the Km. of Christ: for whoever are Kings *Besides*, are certainly Kings *As much as*, Christ in his Km.; and by virtue of being Kings *As much as* Christ, are qualify'd to make *their own* Pleasure, *instead of* Christ's, the Rule of their Government: Since to be Kings *Themselves As much as* Christ, and yet Oblig'd to Govern *Subjectively to* Christ's Pleasure, is a Contradiction. So far you'll agree with me: and if so far, you *must* agree with me farther; for if these upstart Kings in Christ's Kingdom, are qualify'd to Govern according to their own Pleasure *instead of* Christ's, most certainly they are qualify'd to Govern according to their own Pleasure *in Opposition to* Christ's: And if so, sure I am right when I say they are *Kings in Opposition to* Christ; and that their setting up such a Kingdom of Their own within the Kingdom of Christ in Opposition to Christ's, is setting up, not Christ's Kingdom, but the Diavel's: But if it be the Diavel's Kingdom, then the gentlemen who write for it, write for the Diavel's Kingdom; if so, they must not be angry at Me, but at Themselves,

elves, for my calling their own Kingdom and their own Doctrine by the Name of their own. Herein, I think, I'm very consistent with Christianity: for if it be a Christian expression, to call Writing for the Kingdom of Christ, *Writing for the Kingdom of Christ*, 'tis certainly a Christian one, to call Writing for the Kingdom of the Divil, *Writing for the Kingdom of the Divil*.

THIS indeed I ought to have advertis'd the Reader of, before he was a Reader, in order to instruct him, that when I charge Dr. Sh. or the Com. or others, with Wickedness by any name or epithet whatsoever, I wou'd not be thought to reflect on what *they mean* by their Doctrine, but on *their Doctrine*. The badness of the latter is not at all alter'd by the goodness of the former. Give to the Com.'s Doctrine *the Com.'s meaning*, and I'll call it *the Com.'s*; but give to the Com.'s Doctrine *it's own meaning*, and *none but it's own*, and I'll call it *——. The Dean of C. in one Book speaks ill of God, in another of the Bishop: Of God, by Asserting that he has committed the dispensation of his Favour to the Church; Of the Bishop, by Insinuating that he has offer'd a most shocking Indignity to our blessed Lord. In each of these two places, understand the Dean of C's words in a meaning *Distinct from their Own*, and you'll say the

* I. stead of this Dash, in the first Edit. was [*the Divil's*.]

Dean of C. talks like the Dean of C. ; but understand 'em in *their Own*, and you'll say the Dean of C. talks, not like *the Dean*, but, like *the Divel* of C. *

LET me as a friend now, before I dismiss you, give you a little wholesom Advice ; and let me intreat you to follow it. 'Tis only this ;—that for the future you'll talk seriously upon matters of Religion : And let me beg of you, never to Laugh in Print ; but labour rather to convince the world that you are a profound Divine, than a merry Fellow. Love Charity ; not Persecution. Write Christ ; not the Divel. Make a Useful man of an Able one. Make an Humble dean of a Little one. Make a Sound arguer of a Subtil one. Make an ingeniously Good author of an ingeniously Bad one. In one word, make a *Hoadly* of a *Sherlock*.

LET me prevail with you, Dr. to *become* a Christian, to *become* a Gentleman, to *become* a Man, in your Principles ; or at least, in your Writings. At present, I know not what to make of you : for indeed you seem to be none of the Three. I speak this in regard to

* The Assertion refer'd to, in *it's Own* meaning, Robs God of his Prerog. What, pray, is liker *the Divel* ?

The *Insinnuation* refer'd to, is a *Calumny*. What, pray, is liker *the Divel*, who in Greek Authors is frequently put for a *Calumniator*. Nay, you see, even the Dean himself has told us, that every *Accuser* is *the Divel*. Vid. p. 41.

the *Doctrine* you Defend, and your *Manner* of Defending it.

THERE is more colour of reason than reason, in your arguments: and, to do justice to 'em, I think they are fit for the use of such, as are apter to Believe *every* thing, than to Examine *any* thing.

So much to the Dean, concerning the Dean. I beg leave now to trouble him with a word or two in relation to a certain gentleman intitul'd *My Self*. You shall have my Other name by and by; lest not knowing Who I am you shou'd take me for your old friend Mr. Sykes.

DON'T think fit to Answer me: or, if you do, *be sure* to Abuse me; and shew that you are not writing against any Argument of mine, but against *Me*. Tell me, I'm not the Bible, or that the Bible is *hereticK*, *schismaticK*, *phanaticK*, the *τρία Κάππια καὶ ἕνα*, the Triple Alliance against Order and Orthodoxy. Make his Lordship answerable for every little weakness of my Own; and make my Own more than my Own. Say I'm against Christianity; because I stand up for Christ. Say, I have neither Conscience nor Common sense; because I vindicate Conscience and Common sense. Say I Hate the Church; because I Love a Bishop. Finally, wonder at my Impudence in striking at a Committee of Great and Grievous Offenders against the Gospel, by Defending the Gospel.

I leave it to your choice, High and Mighty Dr., either to say all these fine things of me, or else to let All the notice you take of me be This—that *I am not worthy of it.*

If you don't Answer me, I hope at least you'll Remember me : and Regard the good Advice that is given you, as given you

Edinburgh,
August 26.
1718.

A Friend to Christ,
by } and
An Enemy to The Devil.

G. D.

12 MR 58

P. S. The Town has, for these two or three Days, been very solicitous to know, *Who this Dr. Dalrymple is.* Some say, he's an *Irishman*; others will have it, he's an *Englishman*; but Few think he's a *Scotchman*. Abundance of gentlemen have been nam'd on this occasion. The Dr. is *this* man; and the Dr. is *that* man; and the Dr. is *every* man, but the Dr.——To satisfy the Curious, I let 'em know, that there's a certain Scotch gentleman in Town, who, I find, knows the Author perfectly well; can inform 'em, that he is *none* of the persons he is taken for; but that the book inticul'd, *A Letter from Edinburgh*, is *A Letter from Edinburgh*; and that Dr. Gilbert Dalrymple is Dr. Gilbert Dalrymple.

